



**MEETING NOTES**  
**Housing Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday, September 28, 2021**  
**Town Hall Meeting – 7:00 PM**

**Committee Members:** Tom Krebs(Chair), Richard Wright, Christopher Millette (Planning Board), Peter Stanley (Planning Board Consultant),

**Consultant**

None

**Non-Committee Citizens**

Denise Mitchell (Planning Board and Note Taker), Darren Finneral (Planning Board Chair)

**Notes**

Denise Mitchell mentioned that she has resigned from the Housing Committee as she is already on the Planning Board and feels that it would be best not to be doubly assigned. She is attending as a citizen and volunteer note taker. Darren Finneral stated that he too was attending as a citizen and is not a Housing Committee member.

There was discussion about the timing of future actions and how to prepare any warrant articles in time for the March town meeting. Peter Stanley recommended that the committee be aware of the timeframes and that legal counsel should have time to review any proposed zoning changes ahead of any public hearing. Also 2 public hearings should be planned because any changes out of the first meeting would likely need a new hearing to provide adequate public comment on the changes.

Tom Krebs introduced a document that he compiled to help summarize the various changes proposed by Steve Whitman. These were discussed as follows:

Definitions: 2.24 would remove the reference to “residential” development thereby allowing the inclusion of mixed-use. The term “duplex” was also discussed as it is not currently defined in any regulations

Article 4--Business District sections 4.2.1 to increase the of units before a site plan review is required and 4.2.2 removing to adjust the number of units in a cluster development before a site plan review is needed. Both of these would be expected to reduce the planning and legal cost to a developer. There was discussion about whether either or both should have a reference to

“affordable” housing as a caveat to skipping planning. There were concerns that defining “affordable” would be difficult for the town to apply.

Article 5 – Residential District 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 related to changing the number of units that triggers a site review. Again, this would be expected to reduce cost of a development.

Section 5.7.2 to allow two ADUs was discussed as maybe being difficult to define as what constitutes the primary residence and what constitutes the ADU and how to restrict short term rentals over the life of the apartments.

Section 5.7.9 increasing the size of an ADU from 1000sf to 1200sf and allowing up to 3 bedrooms would be difficult to then rent the units at such a rate as to actually be affordable. They would still count as affordable on the books because they are ADUs, but the units might be quite costly to rent. There was also discussion about the recommendation to allow the ADUs to be in detached building as the sole occupancy.

Article 6 – Blodget Landing: 6.12.2 and 6.12.19 that would increase the number of units from 1 to 2 and increase the square footage and bedrooms came up with concerns about whether the sewage systems could handle any more strain.

There was discussion mixed in about allowing duplexes on any lot on which a single family was allowed.

Due to the low attendance of this meeting, no motions were made and next actions will be for Tom Krebs to find another time in a few weeks to hold another meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted,  
Denise Mitchell, Volunteer Note Taker